

Vang, Mai (CI-StPaul)

From: Greta Bjerkness <gbjerkness@wgcmn.com>
Sent: Monday, August 21, 2017 11:26 AM
To: Vang, Mai (CI-StPaul)
Cc: Greta Bjerkness; Laurice L. Gustafson
Subject: 880 CLARK ST, SAINT PAUL MN 55101
Attachments: 7810421266_.pdf; Recorded SC.pdf; 880 Clark.pdf

Importance: High

My File #: 036444E02
Address: 880 Clark Street, St. Paul, MN
Former Owner: Daniel Furlong

Ms. Vang:

I represent U.S. Bank, the holder of the Sheriff's Certificate and now owner of the above-referenced property. The matter is set for legislative hearing tomorrow morning. I plan on attending to represent US Bank's interests. Attached hereto is the notice of hearing, and a copy of the recorded Sheriff's Certificate showing my client's interest/ownership in the property. Here are the actions my client has already taken to attempt to remediate this nuisance property:

1. I submitted a code compliance inspection report earlier this month. I was contacted by inspector Jim Seeger regarding access to the home so I'm thinking all or part of the inspection has been completed?
2. My client obtained an initial repair estimate for the Property, which I've attached hereto. The Bank plans on augmenting this estimate once the CCIR comes back.
3. My client has remediated the nuisance conditions at the property that were identified in an August 11, 2017 summary abatement order. According to my client, they are keeping an eye on this property and there should be no further violations going forward.
4. My client has renewed and paid the vacant building registration fee as of July 2017.

Because there was substantial personal property left at the home, my client opted to start a personal property eviction action against the former occupants/owners. The eviction hearing was held on July 11th, and the actual lock-out took place on August 3rd. By statute, my client is required to store the personal property for 28 days, which expires on August 31st.

My client was initially interested in selling the property as-is to a 3rd party. But because this is a category 2 vacant building, I understand that selling it is not an option at this point. Is there a possibility of transitioning the property back to a category 2 property and allowing a sale of the property with the city's approval? This may be something my client is interested in discussing at tomorrow's hearing.

Please let me know if you have any questions. I will see you tomorrow morning.

Thanks,

Greta L. Bjerkness | Attorney

Wilford, Geske & Cook

A PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION

7616 Currell Boulevard, Suite 200 | Woodbury, MN 55125

Phone: (651) 209-3300 | Fax: (651) 209-3339 | Direct: (651) 209-3313

THIS COMMUNICATION IS FROM A DEBT COLLECTOR ATTEMPTING TO COLLECT A DEBT. ANY INFORMATION OBTAINED WILL BE USED FOR THAT PURPOSE.

This message is intended only for the use of the individual to whom it is addressed, and contains information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivering this message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any unauthorized disclosure, dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us and return the original message to us at the above address by reply to the sender.